UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,329	10/22/2001	Tetsuyuki Miyawaki	112857-286	3661

29175 7590 09/11/2002

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER
DOWLING, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2851	

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/039,329	MIYAWAKI ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William C. Dowling	2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 October 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *5* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other.

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claim 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ooi et al.

See Figures 1 and 2.

3. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Doany et al.

See figures 1 and 2.

4. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Byars.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2-4, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doany et al in view of Ooi et al.

Ooi et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed but does not teach the use of polarizing filter means between the light source and separation means and between the light separation means and the projection means.

Doany et al teaches a projection arrangement using dichroic prisms as the color separation means. A polarizing filter (40) is placed between the light source and light separation means. A second polarizing film (42) is placed between the light separation means and the projection means.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Ooi et al., which uses separated light separating mirrors, by the addition of polarization means, including filters and a polarizing splitter, in order to obtain a projection arrangement having enhanced contrast and polarization control, as taught by Doany et al.

7. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doany et al. in view of Kobayahi et al.

Doany et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed but do not teach the use of polarization means which reflect rather than absorb one of the components.

Kobayashi et al. teaches the known usage of reflection type polarizing means which reflect rather than absorb light of a particular polarization.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of Doany et al. by the substitution of a reflection type polarizer, as taught by

Kobayashi et al. in order to reduce temperature increases in projector components, as taught by Kobayashi et al.

8 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Dowling whose telephone number is (703) 308-1287. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 to 4:00 Eastern time.

wcd
September 6, 2002

William C. Dowling
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2851